



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Entered as second-class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 1, 1879

VOL. V

NEW YORK, JANUARY 27, 1912

No. 13

*(Continued from page 90.)*

To my mind one of the very best papers in the book is Professor Wenley's on *The Nature of Culture Studies*. It is less dazzling than Professor Shorey's article, *The Case for the Classics* (303-343)<sup>1</sup>, and it is not furnished, as Professor Shorey's paper is, with an elaborate array of footnotes giving the fullest references to the vast controversial literature of which the Classics have been the theme (the best published bibliography, by the way, on the subject), but it is everywhere concrete, directly suggestive and stimulating, wholly logical and coherent. Culture studies, says Professor Wenley, link man principally with the past; their roots strike deep into history. "Rome attached the glorious heritage of centuries; Carthage, Syracuse, Athens, Thebes, Sparta, Alexandria, Jerusalem, were swallowed successively. Then she proceeded to annex the hopes of the future—Gaul, Spain, Germany, Britain" (63). We cannot, therefore, rid ourselves of Rome, try as we may.... "when we gaze out upon the past, the petty sloughs away, we are left alone with the spacious things that endowed life with dignity and gifted it with permanent worth. In this wonderful disappearance of the temporary the central meaning of culture studies, like their present efficacy, finds impregnable shelter" (66). Education consists not in what is acquired, but in the manner of acquisition and all that it implies. Hence the studies in which average attainment is least readily elicited by purely mechanical means offer the processes best calculated to bring educational results. Again, culture studies demand a certain personal detachment that makes for individuality, "the one criminal omission of our contemporary <educational> system", by compelling a man to cut loose from things immediately present to sense, to prepare for larger relations, to view detail as a means to a distant end, to acquire mastery for its own all sufficing sake (71). On pages 72 ff. there is an admirable presentation of the intellectual processes called into play by the task of translating a Latin sentence and of the unequivocal demand which Latin makes upon absolute accuracy of intellectual process; nowhere have I seen this thought better presented. In this demand, the author urges, lies the efficacy of Latin as an instrument of education. In culture studies, then, we have the discipline necessary to thought,

<sup>1</sup> See *The School Review*, 18.585-617.

and, as a result of the material employed, an introduction to the great things of life, freed by the lapse of time from all pettiness (75).

The Symposia which constitute the rest of Chapter IV give the result of an admirable plan formulated by Professor Kelsey (the guiding spirit of the Classical Conferences at Ann Arbor), requiring six or seven years for its consummation. Their general theme was the Value of humanistic, particularly classical, Studies as a Preparation for the Professions and for practical Life (I detest the adjective practical here, but can find no better word). Symposia I-IV thus discuss the value of classical studies to the physician (83-98), to the engineer (99-120), the lawyer (121-153), the clergyman (154-209), to the man of affairs (210-259). There is a wide array of contributors, all men of distinction. Thus to the Symposium on *The Value of Classics to Men of Affairs* contributions were made by Ambassador Bryce, Mr. James Loeb, Mr. William Sloane, Hon. John W. Foster, Dr. Charles R. Williams, Editor of the *Indianapolis News*, Dr. Harvey W. Wiley, and Mr. James Brown Scott, Solicitor for the Department of State at Washington. I have not space to give the views of these and other contributors. Possible as it is to object that naturally pains were taken to secure for the Symposia men of assured sympathy with the Classics, one cannot doubt the sincerity of the speakers or deny the value of the testimony of so many men not connected professionally in any way with the Classics.

Limited though our space is, a word must, however, be said about Dr. Wiley's paper on the Value of the Study of Latin and Greek as a Preparation for the Study of Science. Himself a firm believer in the Value of the Classics for men of science, Dr. Wiley addressed a questionnaire to 100 men distinguished in science. 35 responded. A careful reading of the answers, from which Dr. Wiley quotes freely, both for and against the Classics, justifies his remark on page 250: "The surprise that has come to me in studying the replies I have received was produced rather by the large amount of testimony in favor of the classics than by that which is opposed to them". There is plenty of evidence, aside from Dr. Wiley's questionnaire, that scientific men recognize the value of the study of the Classics as a preparation for the study of science.

Symposium VI contains three admirable papers.

Professor E. K. Rand, of Harvard University, deals with *The Classics in European Education*, from Greek and Roman times (260-282). Though professedly only historical, aiming to show to what extent and in what manner the Classics have been (wrongly and rightly) studied, the paper gives a fine presentation of the claims of the Classics to a consideration even to-day in every scheme of education, because everywhere Professor Rand makes it clear that "the true progress of humanism, which is nothing but the ancient program revived, has always pointed men to the treasured ideals of the past and inspired them to action in the present" (282). As long ago as Pericles's time, when the great (Greek) Classic, Homer, was part and parcel of Greek education, "we see the twofold impulse of the human spirit which the study of classical literature normally inspires—reverence for the past, and the passionate desire to act worthily in the present" (260). There is an instructive discussion of the attitude of the Church toward pagan culture. After this comes a discussion of Dante's attitude toward antiquity (264 ff.), and of the study of the Classics, Greek and Latin both, by the humanists (267 ff.). The programme of the humanists after Greek had its sure place there may be seen in Battisto Guarino's *De Ordine docendi et studendi* (1459). The programme contains nothing but Latin and Greek (270);

. . . it is simply the ancient method of Cicero and Quintilian all over again. Both authors are constantly cited for principles as well as facts; *virtutis laus omnis in actione consistit*, said Cicero, and Vittorino echoes the words. Second, it is the basis of every truly humanistic program established from that day to this. Its principles appear in some dozen treatises of the day, and from Italy spread to the North. What I have quoted does not touch all the elements in humanistic education. Science and mathematics received more consideration than one might suppose. Religious training was not neglected, as it is with us; polite demeanor, dress, physical exercise, all were matters for attention. And let me emphasize again the point I would specially make: the twofold character of their education, its reverence for the past and its interest in the present, derives clearly from the ancient prototype.

Rudolphus Agricola, Vivès, Dorat, Budé, Erasmus, Thomas Elyot, "who interpreted Erasmus and Budé to England" (271), Ascham, Bacon, Milton are all in turn considered.

Attention is then given (273 ff.) to various forces that tended to discredit the educational programme based on the Classics. These include the decay of the method itself, due especially to too rigid restriction of Latin style to Ciceronianism<sup>1</sup>, the Protestant Reformation, the famous quarrel between the ancients and the moderns which spread from

France to England, romanticism, German ways of studying the Classics, etc. There is a pertinent query at the close of the paper (282):

Further, I would inquire, how have we teachers of the classics fulfilled our tasks? Have we always kept before us the true ideal of humanism? Have we made the sacred past living and contemporary, or have we banished our subject to a timeless district, illumined, not by the dry light of reason, which is a wholesome effluence, but by the dry darkness of the unprofitable?

To sum up, the book contains much of importance for all classes of readers. It does, to be sure, virtually nothing for the pedagogical side of the Classics. But it states in most suggestive ways, in papers that cross one another frequently, yet have sufficient individuality, the claims of the Classics to a large place in American education. To the non-classical reader the testimony of so many men of parts not in any way concerned with the direct professional use of the Classics should have weight; to the teacher of the Classics the book sounds a call to higher service to his pupils and to his age, by urging him to prepare himself better in his subject and to teach it better by taking a larger and broader view of it, correlating the present and the past, and above all, by being himself, as the result of his classical and humanistic studies, in every way more truly *homo, immo vero vir*. C. K.

#### THE OLD EDUCATION AND THE NEW<sup>1</sup>

Of all the branches of study pursued in school, Latin and Greek have left their marks deepest on the character of education. For many ages, Greek and Latin with Mathematics were the foundations of a liberal education, nay rather, they *were* a liberal education. They were the trivium of the Middle Ages and of later times. No man was considered an educated man who had not devoted years to the study of these subjects and whose mind had not been trained by long-continued pursuit of these branches. That in many cases they were poorly taught, that in many cases the results were not at all commensurate with the time that had been devoted to them, that after years of study there was a woeful ignorance of both Greek and Latin literature and that the knowledge of Mathematics was insufficient to solve the problem of how to make both ends meet were facts seized upon by the ever-ready innovator and were made by him the excuse for a change to more 'practical' subjects and to those which were nearer to the every-day life of the world. With a great blowing of trumpets and beating of drums the Modern Languages and Science, 'the great panacea for all the educational ills of the past', as their advocates claimed, were

<sup>1</sup> See Sandys's chapter, *The History of Ciceronianism* in *Harvard Lectures on the Revival of Learning*, 145-173.

<sup>1</sup> This paper was read at the organization meeting of The Classical Association of the Pacific Northwest, held at Portland, Oregon, June 16-17, 1911.